

REMARKS

Claims 2-8 and 10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9 and 11 are herein cancelled. Claim 3-4, 10 and the specification are herein amended. Claims 2 and 8 are allowed as noted in the Office Action. No new matter is believed to have been entered through the various claim amendments. Further, upon belief, it is respectfully submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 8 are allowed.

Applicant graciously thanks the Examiner for their indication of allowed subject matter.

In view of the indication that claims 2 and 8 are allowed, it is submitted that claims 3-7 and 10 of the present application have been amended as appropriate to depend from either of the allowed claims (e.g., claims 2 and 8), and further, the objected to claims have been amended as appropriate to overcome the objections as indicated below.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-7 and 10 should also be allowed in view of the foregoing comments, in addition to allowed claims 2 and 8.

Objection to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the total number of words exceeded 150 words. By this amendment, the abstract of the disclosure was editorially amended not to exceed over 150 words. Approval and entry of the new Abstract are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw their objection to the Specification.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 1 is objected to because of inconsistencies in usage of the words “decrypting” and “encrypting”.

The word “bite” is used as “bit” in each of the claims.

In Claim 10, “an valid person” should be replaced with -- an authenticated person - .

By this amendment, claim 1 has been cancelled and Claim 3 has been editorially amended to change from “bite” to --bit--. Claim 10 has also been editorially amended to change from “an valid person” to -- an authenticated person --.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner withdraw the aforementioned objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Uyama (US 2002/0126848) in view of Klonowski et al. (US 5,479,514).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As claim 1 has been cancelled and claims 3-7 depend from allowed claim 2, it is respectfully submitted that said claims (e.g., claims 3-7) are patentable for at least the reason of their respective dependencies. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Uyama in view of Sehr et al. (US 2001/0018660).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this amendment, claims 9 and 11 have been cancelled.

Claim 10 is patentable for at least the reason of its dependency from allowed claim 8. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/Joseph W. Iskra/

Joseph W. Iskra
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,485
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

JWI/kn